



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Pat nt and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

AS

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/910,115 08/13/97 BAYCHAR

BAY-310

┌

IM52/0214

┐

FAY SHARPE BEALL FAGAN
MINNICH & MCKEE
104 EAST HUME AVENUE
ALEXANDRIA VA 22301

EXAMINER

JUSKA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

16

DATE MAILED:

02/14/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/910,115

Applicant(s)
Baychar

Examiner
Cheryl Juska

Group Art Unit
1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Cheryl Juska

(3) Arti Singh

(2) Shrinath Malur

(4) Baychar

Date of Interview Feb 9, 2001

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☒ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description:

Examples of the inventive fabric laminates, including those of related applications, were shown.

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending, in general; claim 1, in particular

Identification of prior art discussed:

Evans, Dawn, and Colvin

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

We discussed the prior art with respect to the claimed invention. We discussed clarifying the claim language with respect to the moisture transfer layers, the nonwoven layer, the breathable membrane layer, and encapsulation. We also discussed generally related pending applications 08/887847 and 09/500535 assigned to Singh. We did not come to an agreement at this time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.


CHERYL JUSKA
PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.